P. F. 120 of 93.

G. R. S. IX (1)

Previous reference

L. R. 123 of 91.

1892-93.

(L. R.)

File No 153 of 92.

Serial Nos 1 to 18

Later references

L. R. 142 of 95

L. R. 11 of 95.

GENERAL AND RECENT SECRET MISC.

Serial Nos. 1 to 18

March 1901.

SUBJECT.

Appeal of Adhikarisaheb of Bhavnagar against Gadibundi taluka regarding the division of Sheta Shambhoji.

Memo

Revenue Appeal No. 105
of 1892-3.

Appellant - Krishnamachari
Srinivasa of
Nidadavole Shan-
bogue Cutcherry
of Byrasagar-
kere - Godavari
Range -

On the 13th June 1878
the Dy. Commissioner
of the Kistna District
issued orders fixing
two Shanbogues to
Amani Byrasagar-
kere as it was found
too large for one
Shanbogue, and similarly
fixed two Shanbogues
to the Nuthigur Taluk,
and also to Thippalla-
nally Taluk.

27.8.78 Lutchmanappa
Shanbogue of Nuthigur
Taluk, complained
to the Survey Supt.
against

against this arrange-
ment made by the
Dy. Commissioner
in expression of the
Survey Supdt having
only one Theodolite.

The Survey Supdt. 7-9-78
asked for the Dy.
Commissioner's report
in the matter and
that officer explained 13-9-78
the inconvenience in
having only one Theo-
dolite & these files
and stated that the
revised arrangement
could be carried into
effect in case it
did not collide
with the Survey Rules.

The Survey Supdt. 18-9-78
approved of the Dy.
Commissioner's
arrangement & suggested
that the Police Rights
be divided between
the Rail and the Tram
Theodolites

Shanbogue at 10 annas
and 6 annas respectively
in the rupee.

24-9-78 The Dy. Commissioner
issued orders
accordingly & the
arrangement was
31-10-78 carried into effect
under which the
late Shanbogue Govinda
had been appointed to look after
the land irrigated
by the Western Channel
and Ramappa
the land irrigated
by the Eastern Channel
of Byrapura Kere.
The former had
appointed one
Nandappa as Puna
to do the duties

Ramappah died
in 1881, and the
Shanbogue Gumasta
Nandappa was
18-5-81 appointed to look
after both the duties
until Ramappa's son

Krishnappa

Krishnappa should
attain Majority -
In octobr. 1884 the
said Ramdappa
died and the Asstnt.
Lobbaya failed
to come forward to
do duties himself
or appoint a competent
person; the Amildar
reported the facts &
stated that he was
taking work from
Krishnappa under
Shekdar's supervision 19-12-84.
and the Dy. Commr.
approved of the
arrangement tentatively 11-1-85
The Dy. Amildar 31-3-86.
reported that the
said Krishnappa
had attained Majority
and had worked
satisfactorily &
recommended his
formal appointment
while he also reported

that.

Sloma

2/

that Stal Shantappa in spite of notice sent had not sent a competent pleader but sent only an incompetent and indifferent man who left the place a few days after.

10.5.86 The Dy. Commr. approved of the appointment of Kuttappa and directed that should Sobraya not appoint a competent pleader one should be appointed by Govt

19.7.86 The Dy. Amildar recommended that Appellant Adiappa for trial for six months ~~and the Dy. Commr.~~

24.7.86 ~~approved~~ decided that Shantappa Hucheappa Sobraya petitioned the Dy. Commissioner protesting

protesting against
the appointment
of any other than
his nominee dated -
-minarcah regarding
whom the Dy. Commissr
had reported as unfit
and as having left
the Dharwar place

The Dy. Commissr 24.8.86.
however approved
of the appointment
of the appellant
Adinarayanappa Asad.

The appellant Comr 5.1.88.
-plained to the Survey
Supt. that Potgi was
not disbursed as
fixed viz @ 10 annas
and 8 annas in the
rupee respectively

The Survey Supt ——88.
asked for the Tahsildar's
report, — who reported
that at the time when
Krishnappa was
looking after the whole
work himself
Full-potgi was
disbursed

9

Saints

bidnes ~~Americans~~ &c.

Show the same system
worked in the Hastings
Fiska, and the American
28 · 8 · 89 replied that at Hastings
there was only a division
of the locality but that
both the Shantogues
worked jointly in
collecting cardagen
writing accounts &c.

18 · 12 · 89 The ag. American examin-
-ed the two Shantogues
his brother and the
Appellant ~~American~~ appe-
in this matter; & the
former stated that he
was indifferent whether
the Charge was divided
or not but would like
to have the Fotigh decided
equally between the
two Shantogues, while
the latter stated that
he was ready to work
as ordered either jointly
with the other man or
separately if the work
is defined separately
he being not Reluctant

but

but only agreements

The Deputy Amildr. 4-12-89
reported that all the
disputes could be amicably
and better work got by
giving the sole charge
to one man.

The Dy. Amildar again 16.2.90
reported that much incon-
-venience was felt and that
had been endless disputes
between the two Shanbogues
and the Govt. work suffered
thereby, and that he saw
no other remedy but the
division of the charge between
them.

After some correspondence
between the Dy. Amildar
& the Dy. Comm. the
latter asked the Survey 4.5.91
Supt. for reference giving
the Postage at 10 annas
and 6 annas in the respec
-tive two Shanbogues
respectively.

The Survey Supt. replied 11.7.91
that he had only expressed
opinion that the additional
Shanbogue could be appointed
as an assistant to the
other and the former
Asst. Amildar had the
superior officers, and

that

3/13

3.1.93 The Dy. Inspector sends up the deposition & the Sub. Dist. & Magistrate the same & the Dy. Comm. his opinion concurring that of the Dy. Comm. of having a term of two years at a time as Confusion would arise in the collection of the balance to at the close of each year when the working Official leaves vacates office.

13.2.93

24.2.93 The Dy. Commissioner ordered the arrangement accordingly, and the Sub. Division Officer issued Orders & the Dy. Inspector to carry out & rendered arrangement & Returns & Returns from the Contractor.

S. Dy.

12/8/93.

Nolesom.

Petition No 1102 & 26th Sept. 1896

(Serial No

Petitioner Adimanappa, the Gumasta of the Sthal Shanbhogue of Rahiyasagarkere Gudibanda Sub taluk.

On 30-9-93 the Government passed an order directing that both he (Petitioner) and the respondent - the Sirkar Shanbhogue, should be appointed as joint Shanbhogue and the Potge divided between them in the proportion of 10 to annas respectively as decided in 1878. further the Deputy Com was asked to make suitable arrangements

Continued in the next page

arrangements for withholding

them

Petitioner now prays that

for arrearees of the above

order, by setting aside the full

Policy and dispensing with the

decree of the Respondent for

the following reasons.

That out of a Policy

of Rs. 102-4- Petitioner gets only

Rs. 62-13-6, although he did the

working therefore whereas

the Respondent whose decree,

he alleges, have been discharged

with gets the balance of Rs.

39-6-6 and also enjoys the

benefit of a sum of Rs. 42

remitted in his favor on his

Inam lands for decreed

dispensed with that is Rs.

that the Respondent is in Receipt

altogether

80

49

Spare copy of the issue of 7/3/96 of the Hotel is not available as we have the record up to June 92.

SLB. 26/10/96

DJP
26/10/96

General Records

Please put up circular no. 219 dated 7th October 1874 issued by the Chief Constable

DLH
27/10

Please give the subject of the circular required.

DLH
27/10/96

The circular is about the payment of Police allowances & Shambhogs.

DLH
28/10

The spare copy of the Gazette 7/3/96 is available but a copy may be taken from the Gazette.

SLB. 28/10

DLH
28/10/96

The notice is about the revised rules for the payment of Police & Shambhogs & Patels.

DLH
30/10

a/c of letter of 7th 81-6-6 &
R/ 23-7-96 in respect
of his (petitioner's) own income.

It is noteworthy that the petitioner does not state the net Value accruing to him from the Inam lands in his possession Evidently suppressing the Dameness of the Inam Settlement Order of 1893 and the order of 1878 and that according to both the respondent - the Pirka Shenbopne - has a certain amount of private title.

Besides the Government order of which the petitioner desires a decision is nearly three years old.

Submitted

1869.

9/10/96
Notes of issues &
Orders &
proceedings
Petition
General Records for resp.
9/10

18/10

90

Submitted

The Petitioner has now applied for a reconsideration of Govt decision dated 30th September, 1893, in A.J. No: 108 of 1892-93.

An abstract of the Petition together with the reference quoted therein is put up.

The Petn is dated 26th September, 1896.

The period ordinarily allowed for a review of judgment is 90 days (Sch II art 164 of the Limitation Act).

If is a question for consideration whether the application should be allowed at this distance of time

VL
3/11/96

Article 164 of the Limitation Act however envisages circumstances where the Court may entertain an application for review after the expiry of the period of limitation prescribed therefor when the circumstances justify such entertainment. The manner in which the Court has exercised its discretion in this matter must be described

VL
3/11/96

VL
3/11/96

For Orders
VL 3/11/96

Drafted
TVR 4/11

Recd 5/11

U

Continuation of precis of the file re-
-lating to A. S. No. 108 of 1892–93

Appellant	vs	Respondent
Adinarayappa Karnam of Chan- -bhog Naidupeti Subbarayappa of Kodibandi		Venkatappa

1. On 30-9-93 the Govt. passed the following decision

"Appellant is the Karnam of the State Shanbhog and the respondent is the Deputy Shanbhog. In 1878, both the appellant's principal and respondent parties were appointed joint Shanbhogs and they were directed to divide the Shanbhogi in the proportion of 1/2 and 1/2 annas respectively. In February 1892 the Revenue Division Officer ordered the office to be divided equally between the appellant and the respondent, and in February 1893, the Dy. Commr ordered the two individuals to hold the office by turns once every two years. The appeal is against this order. The appellant requests that the respondent be removed from office as he has no right to it, and as the appointment of two Shanbhogs for one

village is contrary to law."

2. "Respondent's further claim, that appellant's cause of action did not accrue within three years before the commencement of this suit, but that more than three years elapsed between the date of the alleged trespass and the commencement of this suit, is not sustained by the evidence."

3. "Under all the circumstances of the case, we do not think that both the appellant and respondent should recover their costs of this appeal, but that each party should pay his own costs, as decided in 1878."

The appellant accordingly submitted an argument for the division of costs between the appellant and respondent."

2. The above decision was communicated to the appellant's solicitors on 7th May 94.

3. On 26-9-96 appellant's solicitors applied for a reconsideration of that decision urging as follows:-

1. That the plaintiff's claim under Rs. 2,500/27-8-96, had been settled, that the defendant's counter claim for the village lands had been withdrawn, and that the only matter in dispute was the costs of the appeal.

2

23

being half of the assessment of the said ... which is in excess of his salary.

3. One Venkappa who was the ... of that Shanbhog and the appellant have each discharged the duties of Shanbhogship (without the help of any other person) the former for 3 years from Jan 88 to Feb. 1888 and the latter for one year in 1890, while the respondent was officiating for the Shanbhog of Mandur. Since only one bond is required for all the lands of the village, duty could not be distributed between the appellant and the respondent and so only one set of accounts is being prepared all along. The Tahsildar consequently expressed his opinion in his Report No. 320 of 18-12-89 and No. 50 of 18-2-90 that only one person should be appointed to the Shanbhogship of the village.

The appellant therefore begs that the above grounds may be considered, the previous records perused and the above Tahsildar's appeal decision reconsidered and after dispensing with the services of the respondent whose claim has been declared to be void, orders may be passed for the payment of the whole of the [illegible] amount to the appellant alone.

No. 4408 / P.7.120-93 of 10-11-93

4. Whereupon the Dy. Commr. was asked with reference to the decision of Govt. directing

that both the Applicant and the Respondent be appointed joint Chaudhrys of [illegible]-hire, [illegible], and the fees divided between them in the proportion of 10 annas and 6 annas as decided in [illegible] to report:-

How the above arrangement is working, whether two Chaudhrys are necessary in the charge and whether he would propose any change -

And also to describe the manner in which the work has been ~~[illegible]~~ divided between these Chaudhrys.

6. The Deputy Collector in submitting letter No. 138 of 21 Oct. 97 from the Sub-division officer of [illegible] together with the connected papers stated :- No. 2259/733 of 26-1-98.

"It would appear that no distribution of work has been made between them and that they are jointly conducting the work - It would also appear that the same are not working smoothly. The charge is however a large one with an area of [illegible] acres [illegible] assessed at Rs. 3346-12-0 - Two Chaudhrys were considered necessary at the Survey Settlement and it is desirable to have both."

"The Dy. [illegible] of [illegible] has solicited instructions whether a division of the work might be made into two different blocks according to Survey Nos. or according to the two channels [illegible] which the lands are situated. I myself think it would be better to divide the charge into two parts one for each channel and shall submit my proposal [illegible] of details as to Nos. of holdings, extent, assessment

29

~~Received~~ in the Registered Branch to file in the Cell on the 11 June 1898 Shambhog Library Rec. No. 315 Sent to the Library on the 6 June 1898 Shambhog Rec. No. 316 to 6/6/98.

HK
21/10/98.

There are two points in Mrs
(1) Should the order of Sept-
5/5/94 be revised?
or in other words is there any
necessity for two Shambhogs?
(2) Supposing two Shambhogs
are necessary, how is
the work to be distributed?

The G.O. of 1894 can be
justified only on the
assumption that 2 Shambhogs
are necessary for the village;
for the Res. Landlord is a
Sole a Shambhog whose duties
seems to have been suspen-
ded & cannot claim

the office if his services
are not required. But
the Accountant states that
2 Shampoos are quite necessary
& suggests a number known
discretion.

Before such an arrange-
ment - which is quite
exceptional & is not recognized
by the Ships Rules & other
Standing orders - is sanctioned,
it would seem to be desirable
to call for the opinion
of the Sanitary Dept.

4/11/95

10109

After a good deal
was spent (I find
so far back as
1893 & it would
now be useful
the Army Dept.

The officer states
that 2 shampoos a
week and the
distribution of the
use of the hand
of the Indian
seem equitable &
just and in the
last way a great effect
Nov 10 of 1893 in a
[illegible]

31

Continuation of Index of
the file pending in S.C. No. 108
of 1892-93
Appellant & Respondent
Adinarayya &c. Krishnappa
Summary of
Shanbhogue Kanda-
-giri ~~Appa~~ Subbayappa
of Gudibanda

Govt. docket No: 2146 dated 12-12-1898.
Jr 120-93

12/12 · 12 · 1898.

1. The Government in re-
-turning the records received
with their ltr: Communication
No: 385/390 dated 4.10.98 for
reference and resubmission
Enquired whether the State
Circar Shanbhogue of Amanikere
Amanikere in Gudibanda
Taluq would not agree to
some arrangement by
which one of them should be
the principal Shanbhogue &
the other his deputy

2. The Dy: Comm^r called for a report on the points from the Sub. Div. officer of Srikaulayam

No: 2403/1744 dated 21/25 : 12 : 1898

3. The Sub. Div. officer sent orders to the Dy. Amildar of Jeedibanda to enquire and report whether the Shanbhogues would agree to the arrangement proposed by Govt:-

Order No: 3499 4 1 99

4. The Dy. Amildar after ~~enquiring~~ enquiring the Shanbhogues replied that they declined to agree to the arrangement.

Report he is dated 2-1-99

5. The Dy: Comm^r of Kasar replied that the Shanbhogues declined to accept the proposal and resubmitted the Remarks papers together with a copy of Srikakulayam Sub. Div. office docket No: 408 dated 20/25 . 2 . 99.

No 2256/99 dated 7 March 1899

CR
18/3/99

By Noti

Pet^{n} No. 1102 & 29/9/96

Pet^{r} - Adranappa
Gramata of Shala Shambozee -
By pass Road Kare
Gunderbadla Lat Taluk

Subject - Prayer for reconsideration
of Sat. decision 30-9-93
55-94
(Sr No 5 Open file)

The review petition was presented
more than 2 years after the
date of the decision but a
report was called for from
the Dy Comm^{r} regarding the
necessity for 2 shambozs for
one village & with reference
to the Dy Comm^{r}'s view in the
matter.

(General Serial No. 32.)

1892. 3

No. 1740 (2)

Name of Petitioner. Ramappa s/o Ramappa

Village. Veerapapa, Taluk of Shorapur.

Taluk. Shorapur Kree Krista Gurubarao

District. Kolar

Date of Arzi. 10—1—93

Date of Receipt. 14—1—93

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. one

ABSTRACT.

The Naiks of the Court Shorapur & the pattels before at 6 ans & 10 ans in the rupee respectively Lately the Court the Sheristadar and the Dy. Commr have fixed them at 8 ans each. Prays that he may be restored

S. Rao

28/1/93. Criminal Case
& civil suit both
Stamp sufficient
Copy Brief invited
In time —

Call for records with letter

Mysore Govt. Central Press Bangalore—7-9-92,—1000.

RR
23/2

(General Serial No. 30.)

1893

From

The Deputy Commissioner
Kolar District

To

The Chief Secretary to the Dewan
of Mysore.

Dated Camp Muli-giri
Despatched April 1893.
Received

Enclosures No. 1 Enclosure

General No. E 612 1892-93.
No. 751

His Official Memorandum No. 116 dated the 31st ultimo forwarding for submission of proceedings with a petition from Adivaraiyya Gumasta of Vanti-giri Subrayappa, Shanbhogue of Byrasagara Hice, Gudibanda Sub-Taluk, appealing against this office order dated 11th December 1892 regarding the division of Fotige amount between the Shanbhogue and the Government

herewith returned with its enclosure

Hunderigue of the said village.

As called for in the above, I have the honor to submit herewith as per accompanying Serishta Proceedings bearing on the subject together with a copy of the Chick-ballapur Sub Division Officer's letter No 553, dated 29th instant explaining the circumstances of the case.

Deputy Commissioner
Kolar District

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.
PETITION DEPARTMENT.
RECD. No. 1740. 92
DATE 14-1-93

A.S. No. 108
92-93.

43

Before the Government of *His Highness* the Maharaja of Mysore.

Serial (6)

Appeal No. 108 of 1892-93.

L.R. 153-92-4

Appellant.	Vs.	Respondent.
Annamajja jamadar of Kanchiny Nandagire Subbarayappa of Gudibanda, Kolar district.		Krishnappa.

Decision. 23-9-93

Appellant is the jamadar of the Kala Kanchiny and the Respondent is Circa-Kanchiny. In 1875, both the Appellant's Principal and Respondent's father were appointed joint Kanchiny, and they were directed to divide the Patagi in the proportion of 12 and 6 annas respectively. In February 1892 the Sub-Division Officer ordered the Patagi to be divided equally between the Appellant and the Respondent, and in February 1893, the Deputy Commissioner ordered the two individuals to hold the Office by turns one every

every two years. The Officer is against this order. The Applicant, requests that the Respondent be removed from Office as he has no right to it, and as the appointment of two Mandiraja for one village is contrary to rules.

2. Respondent's father having been appointed Mandiraja in 1898, he cannot be now turned out, but the Government Considers that the order of the Deputy Commissioner directing the Patas to be divided equally was unwilled for, and that the order for holding the Office by turns is Contrary to the existing practice and orders.

3. Under all the circumstances of the case, the Government direct that both the Applicant and Respondent be appointed as joint Mandiraja and the Patas divided between them in turns the

W6

(6)

No 1740
ai 158

Office of the Revenue Surveyor
Dated 5th October 1894
15th May 1894.
9.

L.R. 153-92-5 Endorsement granted to Administratrix, Estate of Chandiram Kandayiri Vaidyanathan for payment of Stamp duty on Petition dated 19th May 1894 A.S. 108 of 1892-93 applying against the order of the Deputy Commissioner of Kolar, dated 11th December 1893, regarding the performance of the duties of Chandhagi of Byrasagara Kere.

—

In petty Petitions to referred to the Deputy Commissioner, who has been instructed to divide

le
Pétaja in the Jurisdiction
of Rand & annex as dis-
cribed in 1875, and to
make definite arrange-
ment for the division
of work between Peti-
tioner and the Respon-
dent Stishnajja.

[illegible]
29th Jan 1881

By Order

[illegible]

[illegible] Chief Secretary

[illegible]

V. Records for copy Rec

Gen. Serial No. 32.]

1896

No. Pet No 1102 A.S. 27 96-97

Name of Petitioner. Adinarayana Gumasta of Chamboguri Subrayappa

Village. Gudi Bande Hosahalli

Taluk. Gauribande Sub Taluq

District. Kolar.

Date of Arzi. 26th Sept 1896

Date of Receipt. 29th Sept 1896

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. Nil.

ABSTRACT.

Petr prays that the decision of Govt passed on Rev: Appeal no 15 of 1892-93 and conveyed to him by Govt no 1740/180 of 5th May 1894 regarding the distribution of Patel amount between the Sthl and Circar Shanbogues and directing the Petr to distribute work between them may be reconsidered on the following grounds:-

1. In pursuance of Chief Commr circular No 217 of 27th Dec 1873, it was settled that the Patel amount (including contingencies for the village shall be Rs 10-2-4 and the Survey Settlement Fee on Rs 18 was settled to be Rs

L.R. 153-92-6

1892-93 Reg 1740 Misc

Decision 1901 of 5-5-94 Rev Appl

Pet 120-93

Abstract 6-21 Appl

3-10-96

Pet Rs 20 of 93 Appeal.

Reg

5-10-96.

Petitioner - Adinarayappa the Sthl Shanbogue of Bheemasagarakere, Gauribande Sub-Taluk,

On 30-9-93 the Collector passed orders directing that the (Petitioner) and the Respondent - the Sirkar Shanbogue-Shenkai be appointed as Joint Shanbogues and the Patel emolts between them in the proportion of 10 & 6 annas respectively, as decided in 1878. Further the Dist Commr was asked to make similar

Copy furnished with the abstract

Govt 16th of Sept 1896 Rev Dept Appeal Petn of Adinarayana Gumasta of Chamboguri Subrayappa

annually by Govt to Appellant,
the Sthal Shanbogue ~~since abt~~ in addition to
~~the potigi amt of~~ Rs 102-4. Rs 84¼ being
~~the calculated to be~~ the ~~amount~~ leave of
his Inam Lands, and consequently the
right of the respondent Krishnappa to
the Office has ceased.

(2) When the Survey Superintt settled the
Shanbogue's charges, he found that the
services of the respondent, the Sircar Shanboque,
were of no use and dispensed with them
according to ~~Inam~~ Sec 8 cl 7 of the Inam Rules
and Chief Comrs Procs: No 10699 of 7-3-78
and charged ~~the~~ Inam lands ~~of~~ that heirs ~~engaging in lieu of shanbogue duties~~ that were in the Sirkar
with a quitrent of ~~the~~ 5 ~~annas~~ ¼ thereof
~~granted him~~ the title deed No 1093.

(3) The Deputy Comr ~~passed the~~ order
No 189 of 24th Sept 75 to the effect that
Sthal Shanboque Subragappa should look after
the duties of the Western Channel ~~and the Duties~~ Valve
of the Eastern Canal Kalve being ~~shared~~ the charges by
the Palace Shanboque Narnappa, the respondent's father;
and that out of the ~~Sockery~~ remuneration determined formerly, 10/16 ths
annas 6 should be taken by the appellant
and ~~the~~ 6 annas 10/16 ths by the Respondent. This decision
appeared to Rules Nos 29 & 33 of Chief Comrs
Circular No 219 of 27th Feb 1874 and to Procs:
No 10699 of 7th march 1878.

(4) By the above decision of the
Deputy Comr, the 6 annas 10/16 ths is being
paid to the Respondent contrary to ~~Inam~~ Rules paras 41 & 89 of the
and Chief Comrs Circular No 219 and the Appellant is thereby
~~has been~~ subjected to considerable loss.

(5) The Potigi assigned to this village is
Rs 2-4-0. Out of this the 6 annas 10/16 ths
Respondent is paid Rs 3-6-6 and the
6 annas 5/16 ths Appellant receives only
Rs 2-13-6. The ~~Inam~~ amount
Rs 84¼ is being collected from the
Appellant

paid ~~Rs~~ 62-13-6 instead of the whole total amount being paid to the Appellant alone, and according to the Chief Comrs Circular no 219 dt 27-10-74 Rule 23, the Appellant has not been excused from the payment of Rs 10-11-3 being half of Rs 21-6-6 which is in excess of the Policy sum.

(7) One Nandappa who was the Gramsevak of Ithal Chanbapur ~~for the 5 years beginning with~~ ~~from may 1881 to October 1885~~ and the appellant have each discharged the duties of Chanbapur alone (without the help of any other person) the former ~~from~~ for 5 years from may 1881 to October 1885 and the latter for 1 year in 1890 while the Respondent was officiating for the Chanbapur Circle only one map is ~~drawn~~ prepared for all the lands of this village, duty could not be distributed between the appellant & Respondent and so one ~~of the~~ account is ~~was~~ being prepared all along. The similar consequently expressed his opinions in his report no 320 dt 18th December 1889 and no 387 dt 18-2-90 to the District that only one person should be appointed to

to the franchise of the village.

The petitioner therefore begs that ~~the~~ the above grounds may be considered, the previous records perused and the above-mentioned appeal ~~re~~ decision reconsidered and after dispensing with the the services of the Respondent whose claim has been declared to have ceased, orders may be passed for the payment of the whole of the Police Amount to the Appellant alone.

R.L.

9/10/96

698

From

189 6

(8)

To The Sp. Comm. Malay

L.R. 153-92-7

Dated 16 Dec

Despatched 20 Dec/96

Received

General No. 24488

C.O. No. 120-93

Enclosure No.

This Office No. 120/16 dated 5th May, 1893 + Communicating the decision of Lord in H.S. Cases of 1892-93 (Thomas & Nicholaspillai), directing that both the Appellant and the Respondent be appointed joint Sivalagans of Byravagamiar, Sadasivanda Chettiar, and the Pooja divided between them in the proportion of 10 annas and 6 annas as decided in 1878.

With reference to the above has the honor to request that the Sp. Commissioner will be good enough to depute some trustworthy arrangements

arrangement is working, 59
where the Shanbogues
are necessary, for Re-
Charge and where he
had proposed any change.
The manner in which he
work has been divided
between the Shanbogues
must be described.

By order

Cy draft 16/11/96
for Secy.

SWR
16/11

62

The Deputy Amildar of Gudibanda has solicited instructions whether a division of the work might be made into two different blocks according to Survey Nos. or according to the two channels under which the lands are situated. I myself think it would be better to divide the charge into two parts one for each channel and shall submit my proposals on receipt of details as to Nos. of holdings, Extent, assessment &c under each channel.

Asstt Commr

Dy Commissioner

Compd Draw

63 1898 (10)

From

The Secretary to Govt
Revenue and Res Dept

To

The Deputy Commissioner
of the Kolaba

L. R. 153-92-9

Dated 17

Despatched 17 Dec 1898

Received

General No. 8757 f.

P.F No. 120-93

(1158)

Enclosure No.

Referring to the Mr
Court docket No. 2459
733
dated 26.1.98, has the honor
to state that the further
report therein referred to,
regarding the working of
the present
the Panvel system of levying
the paid Shanbhags for
Bajarasgaon village,
is awaited but to
request that the Submission
of his proposal regarding
the division of the Shanbhogi
work into two separate
charges may be expedited

The Records received with
the above are returned for reference
reference and resubmission

By order

16/12/98 for Secretary

+25-5-2085
18/3/98

Submission received
22/1/98 as also forwarded
15/2/98

(11) 62 [Gen. 31.] 1898-99

REVENUE Gl. No. 2478 GEN
OCT 7 1898
DEPUTY'S OFFICE

Subd
7/10/98
Mem & Recd
15/10/98

From The Deputy Commissioner
No Can District

To
The Secretary to the
Government of Mysore.
Revenue and General Depts

Dated 4-10-98
Despatched 6-10-98
Received
General No. 1455
No. 390
Enclosure No. 4 (Rs on 14/10/98 Maps and Plans)

Submitting for sanction proposals in re the distribution of work between the two Shanabhogs of the Byrasagara Bank in the Gundibande Sub Taluk

Mr Krishniengar Subscribed 31/10/98
17.10.98
Continuation proceedings prepared 21/10/98
RK

Sub to Govt Consideration with proceedings
14/11/98

L.-R. 155-98-10

Rec Petition Rs
7-10-98

Rec
8/10.

Genl: Rds
Please put up Rs 120 Cy
Containing the Rs quoted in the letter
Rs 120 Cy 3 Inches
14/10/98 14-10-98

No 1455 Enc 4
390

Kolar Deputy Commissioner's office
Dated 4th October 1898.

To

The Secretary to the Government
of Mysore
Revenue and General departments.

Sir,

With reference to your endst No
8757 of the 17th March 1898 in re the
petn of 20-9-93
alleged illegality of work between the two Shan-
-bhogs of the Nyavagara Cauki in the
Gudibanda Sub Taluk, I beg to submit
herewith copies of letters No 131 and 136 of
the 14th and 19th September 1898 from
the Subdivision officer of Chickballapur
making proposals for alignment, and to
state that I concur with him in his proposal
which is to give to the Sist or the Kamma
Shanbhog Survey No 1 to 218
and to the Sirkar or the Gauna Shanbhog
Nos 216 to 444 ——.

2 The Vernacular records
are -

are respectfully addressed to the Village Mukh —

90

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient Servant

Illegible

for Deputy Commissioner

Kolar District

Illegible

67

Chickballapur
14th September 1898

No 731

Encl 1 Parwana & 2 files of records.

From

M. Doraswamy Iyer Esquire

Sub divisional officer -

To

The Deputy Commissioner

Kolar -.

Sir,

With reference to your yadi number 206 dated the 27th January 1898 forwarding copy of your letter of the 26th January 1898 to the Government about the distribution of work between the two Shanabhogs of Anandi Parvasagara in Gudibanda Sub Taluk, I have the honor to forward herewith the records received back from the Deputy Amildar of Gudibanda with his anji dis 71 of the 9th instant wherein are discussed two ways of effecting the distribution - Channelwar and numberwar. The deputy Amildar thinks that the channelwar division of the lands for two - separate charges will be attended with difficulties and lead to confusion. The best method would be that by which the two shanabhogs can distinguish easily the lands of each charge - I agree with the deputy Amildar in his recommendations

recommendation of a numbers per division. The matter was proposed to allot to the 10 anna Share Survey Nos 1-310 with an aggregate assessment of Rs 2388-6-0 and the rest of them Nos 311-348 with an aggregate assessment of 1976-12-0 to the six anna Shares or to give to the 6 anna Share Survey Nos 1-225 assessment Rs 1992-12-0 and to the 10 anna Share Nos 226-348 assessment Rs 3392-4-0. The 10 anna charge will have by the 1st Method Land of some 35 Rs assessment in excess and by the 2nd method Land of some 19 Rs in excess, of course, giving rise to a deficiency in like sums for the 6 anna charge. The Patel on an assessment of Rs 35 or 19 must see very small and I beg to propose for your consideration the division of charges in Survey Nos 1-310 and 311-348 as the best possible under the circumstances as agreed at the Sabha and stood. Even here numbers 311-315 which would belong to the 6 anna Share remain higher up and close to the 10 anna Share and if all these numbers are added on to the 10 anna charge a better division can be obtained. I have asked the Deputy Amildar to let me know the extent and assessment of numbers 311-315 and shall submit the information as soon as it is received.

The Sabha is agreed and the

(12)

1898

From

The Secretary to Govt
of Bengal Rev.
& Agrl Deptt

To

The Deputy Commissioner
Kolar

L.R. 153-92-12

Dated 10th

Despatched 12 Dec 98

Received

General No. 4146.
P.C. No. 120-93

Enclosure No.

Correspondence ending with the Dep Comrs letter No
1457/390 dated 4.10.1898, submitting proposals regarding the distribution of work between the two Shanbhags of the Byrasagara Circle in the Gudibanda Subdh.

In returning the records of the case for needful reference and resubmission I am directed to request that he will be good enough to state whether the Shanbhags in this case would

10-12-98

would Mr Magee ~~to [illegible]~~

~~such arrangement as to~~ 72

~~the same such arrange-~~

by which

~~ment as to have one of~~

~~them as the Municipal Attorney and the other his deputy~~

~~to act~~ act.

By order

for Secretary

8/12/28.

8/12/28

7 [Gen. 31.]

1897

L. R. 153-92-14

From The Subdivisional officer
Chickballapur.

To Deputy Commissioner
~~The Secretary to the~~
~~Board of Mysore~~
Kolar.

Dated 20 } February 97.
Despatched 25 }
Received

General No. 408
No.

Enclosure No. 1 file & 1 basket.

With reference to his memo No. 2403/1744 dated the 2nd December last forwarding for report copy of letter No. 446/120-93 of the 12th idem, requesting to be informed whether the Chairmen & Vice-Chairmen of the Cyanagar tank in the Sidlaghatta Subdivision would not agree to some arrangement by which one of them should be the principal the other being his deputy.

With reference to the above, has

76

I have the honor to forward (herewith) the enclosed correspondence ending with Bagshalli's [#] Memorandum of this date; as the latter will be the last from which it will be seen that the Kanungoes do not agree to the arrangement proposed in the Secretary's Memorandum under reply.

(Signed) W. S. Oversmidyer.
Subdivisional Officer
Chickballapur

On temporary charge of Gudibanda Sub Taluk

4 Copies

Lt Pauly
Deputy Commissioner
Kolar District

79

order of 1891, for a review
of which no application should
have been made. This application for review
~~application~~ is accordingly
rejected & the arrangement
proposed by the Govt.
is sanctioned

Draft
C,

Secretary

To
Tirthankara Kalan
Draft with the records

5-9-99

6/10/99

Refer

4.1.1900. 5/1/1900

To Ver: Records for refer.

4/1/1900

31.

Genl: Records.

Please put up Qr 1209/99.

which was returned to you on 7.12.99.

L. R. 153-Qr-17

1-2-1900.

2-2-1900

4/2/00

For chief Accountant Br.

Qr. Genl 3/12-177. Ans Qrs.

2 70 Rev: Records.

Genl. Records

Please put up Ors Nos

10699/229 27-3-78

5/2/00

Papers were sent for Ref: 1/Feb 229

6/2/00

Subd to Rec C & Dr

(1) application bears 2R stamp duly cancelled
to H. H. the Maha Rani Regent.

(2) Brings forward minutes of Govt dated 31.8.1899 respecting his former application

9.2.1900. 5.30 Pm 28.2.00

599

(18)

1899

No. 1214

Name of Petitioner Adimurappa Jun
of Vaddigeriakka Hala Shanu

Village Byrenagarakere

Taluk Gubbi

District Kolar

Date of Arzi 25-9-99

Date of Receipt 20-12-99

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure One Govt Endt No 102-1740 & 31-8-99

ABSTRACT

Addressed to H. H. The Maharani Regent.

Petn C. Petur Krishnappa & Adimurappa. Nanappa, Govt Sub-Mag.

With reference to Govt Rev No 102-1740 & 31-8-99 rejecting his petition for mining, states that as per Govt Sale Sec: 29-33 (No 229 & 27-3-74) the Survey Dept has made the Byrenagarake village into one charge having a Govt of Rs 102-4-6 that for the above Govt rent was given on Grant Cowle

assessed at Rs 84-4-a ~~for~~ the remaining Rs 18 ~~&~~ was being paid to him in cash; that by Govt. proceedings No. 10699/229 dt 7-3-78 the C. Petnr. (Govt. Shanbhag) was removed from the duty & his Inam land was taxed with quit rent; that Chief Commr's proceedings No. Confd 14 dt. 18-9-77 is to the effect that the settlement made by the Survey Supdt. should not be changed; that in spite of the above proceedings it is quite unjust to give the C. Petnr. a portion of the full charge, while the C. petnr. has no right whatsoever to anything; that since the year 84-85 he was asked to pay assessment on his Inam land, but instead of pay him the full portion amount in return, the C. Petnr. was paid Rs 37-6-0 that the Asst. of James in the Superintendent demanding from him the full assessment on his Inam land also.

Prays that according to Govt. Proceedings No. 10699/229 dt 7-3-78, he may be placed in full charge of the Shanbhagi of Byadagadakere

S.B

Rev. Journal, Page 270

SM
23/12/58.

1214

1214

229

ਸਕੂਲ ਦਾ ਨਾਮ ਦਰਜ ਕਰਨ ਸਬੰਧੀ ਹਦਾਇਤਾਂ ਜਾਰੀ ਕਰਨ ਬਾਰੇ।

ਉਪਰੋਕਤ ਵਿਸ਼ੇ ਸਬੰਧੀ ਲਿਖਣਾ ਹੈ ਕਿ ਸਰਕਾਰੀ ਸਕੂਲਾਂ ਵਿੱਚ ਦਾਖਲ ਹੋਣ ਵਾਲੇ ਵਿਦਿਆਰਥੀਆਂ ਦੇ ਜਨਮ ਸਰਟੀਫਿਕੇਟ ਵਿੱਚ ਦਰਜ ਨਾਮ ਅਨੁਸਾਰ ਹੀ ਸਕੂਲ ਰਿਕਾਰਡ ਵਿੱਚ ਨਾਮ ਦਰਜ ਕੀਤਾ ਜਾਵੇ। ਇਸ ਸਬੰਧੀ ਸਕੂਲ ਮੁਖੀ ਵੱਲੋਂ ਕਿਸੇ ਵੀ ਕਿਸਮ ਦੀ ਕੋਈ ਤਬਦੀਲੀ ਨਹੀਂ ਕੀਤੀ ਜਾਵੇਗੀ। ਜੇਕਰ ਕਿਸੇ ਵਿਦਿਆਰਥੀ ਦੇ ਨਾਮ ਵਿੱਚ ਕੋਈ ਤਬਦੀਲੀ ਕਰਨੀ ਹੋਵੇ ਤਾਂ ਉਸ ਲਈ ਸਬੰਧਤ ਵਿਦਿਆਰਥੀ ਦੇ ਮਾਤਾ-ਪਿਤਾ ਜਾਂ ਸਰਪ੍ਰਸਤ ਨੂੰ ਸਬੰਧਤ ਸਕੂਲ ਮੁਖੀ ਪਾਸ ਲਿਖਤੀ ਦਰਖਾਸਤ ਦੇਣੀ ਹੋਵੇਗੀ। ਸਕੂਲ ਮੁਖੀ ਵੱਲੋਂ ਦਰਖਾਸਤ ਦੀ ਪੜਤਾਲ ਕਰਨ ਉਪਰੰਤ ਹੀ ਨਾਮ ਵਿੱਚ ਤਬਦੀਲੀ ਕੀਤੀ ਜਾਵੇਗੀ।

2 ਇਹ ਵੀ ਹਦਾਇਤ ਕੀਤੀ ਜਾਂਦੀ ਹੈ ਕਿ ਸਕੂਲ ਵਿੱਚ ਦਾਖਲ ਹੋਣ ਵਾਲੇ ਵਿਦਿਆਰਥੀਆਂ ਦੇ ਜਨਮ ਸਰਟੀਫਿਕੇਟ ਦੀ ਫੋਟੋ ਕਾਪੀ ਸਕੂਲ ਰਿਕਾਰਡ ਵਿੱਚ ਲਗਾਈ ਜਾਵੇ।

3 ਇਹ ਹੁਕਮ ਤੁਰੰਤ ਪ੍ਰਭਾਵ ਤੋਂ ਲਾਗੂ ਹੋਣਗੇ।

ਜ਼ਿਲ੍ਹਾ ਸਿੱਖਿਆ ਅਫਸਰ (ਸੈ.ਸਿ.)
ਫਾਜ਼ਿਲਕਾ

ਨਕਲ ਸੂਚਨਾ ਅਤੇ ਲੋੜੀਂਦੀ ਕਾਰਵਾਈ ਹਿੱਤ ਜਾਰੀ ਕੀਤੀ ਜਾਂਦੀ ਹੈ।

ਜ਼ਿਲ੍ਹਾ ਸਿੱਖਿਆ ਅਫਸਰ (ਸੈ.ਸਿ.)
ਫਾਜ਼ਿਲਕਾ

(19)

L.R. 153-92/18

By order,

for Secretary

dotumed D hen
and Mas after the
the appointments
of the Appellants
by Govt. the Dy.
Commissioner
had ordered the
distribution accor-
ding to the scale
fixed previously
viz at 10 annas
and 6 annas in
the rupee respectively.

6.3.89. The two Shanbogs
Krishnappa complain
to the Dy. Comm.
of the unequal
distribution of
Potji which himself
and the other Shanbogs
disliked work; the
Dy. Amildar who
28.3.89 was asked a report
stated that their duties
had not been separately
defined nor the
charges divided
among

them and that they
did work & prepare
accounts jointly.

The Dy. Comm. 14.6.89
thereupon directed
the distribution
as originally fixed
at 10 annas and
6 annas in the
rupee respectively.

The said Shanbogues 15.6.89
then petitioned the
Treasury Officer on
the subject, who referred 17.6.89
the matter to the Dy.
Comm for disposal
and that Officer repeated 6.7.89
his previous orders
on the subjects —
and also asked a report
whether the division of
the charge between the
Shanbogues would not
remove the disputes and
lead to better work being
got from them.

The Dy. Asstt. wrote 19.8.89.
Damiwar of the Gori-
- bidnur

that if both accused were doing equal work jointly potige could be divided equally too.

16. 7. 91 The Dy. Commissioner thereupon asked the Dy Amildar whether the two Shanbogues were working jointly & equally and the Dy Amildar replied in the affirmative

31. 1. 92 The Sub-Division Offi-

7. 2. 92 (of the newly constituted Sub-Division) issued orders directing the equal distribution of the Potige between the two Shanbogues.

28. 5. 92 The appellant thereupon appealed to the Dy. Commr against the above order of the Sub-Division Officer.

19. 7. 92 The Dy. Commr. called for the records & enquired whether the 2 Shanbogues worked jointly & did equal work: the statements of these Officials were taken

16. 11. 92 & the effect that they worked jointly

After some correspondence between the Dy. Commr and the Sub. Division Offr as regards the work done by each & the preparation of the accounts the Dy Commr observed that the records showed that the Sub. Division Officer directed the equal division of the Potige in contravention with the ~~Sub Divisional Officer's~~ Survey Instructions opinion, and rejected the appeal of the appellants ordinarily appeal; and enquired also whether the two Shanbogues might not be made to keep up the work by turns of each two years each - 11.12.92

The Sub Division Officer referred the matter to the Dy. Commr & asked him to obtain the statements of the two Shanbogues & send up - 16.12.92

The two Shanbogues made 31.1.93
a joint statement to the effect that they preferred working jointly, but that if it be ordered that they should by turns they would obey but begged that instead of the turn of two years one year might be fixed.

The

To Chief Sec

I think there was some reference to this made in the last meeting of the Defence Committee about performance of bridging of trenches & demolition [illegible]. The Director said he was not prepared to value the result favourably. I am afraid the present order may lead to complications & it may not be practicable to apportion the duties between 2 branches. The question is an important one.

1 Nov/93 [illegible]

Memo

[illegible]

[illegible]

7 [illegible] 98

[illegible]

Section [illegible]

[illegible]

Committee

[illegible]

17

The Judicial Comm[illegible]

has doubtless seen the Draft Regs
for 93 published. There is nothing
in it about Shambesses d.d. by turns -
Subject no 21 Uses & Rules -

It is no doubt inconvenient
& objectionable for shambesses & offices
by turns - & in practice it has
been found most convenient &
where & the principles laid down
in the Post Rules for constituting
Shambesses Firkins, & & the Firkins
Conducted by the Surveyor &
Superintendent in accordance
with those Rules -

Otto May

the amount of Rs. 18 was settled to the pair annually by Govt. to the Appellant, the Sthl Shanbhog, in addition to Rs. 8 1/4 being the levies of his Inam lands and consequently the right of the respondent Krishnappa to the office has ceased.

2. When the Survey Superintendent settled the Shanbhogi charges, he found that the services of the respondent, the Circar Shanbhog were of no use and dispensed with them under Section 8 Col 7 of the Inam Rules and Chief Comm's Pro. No. 1699 of 7-3-78 and charged the Inam lands that were in the Enjoyment of the Circar Shanbhog with a quit-rent of Rs. 5/- in lieu therefor title deed No. 1693

3. The Dy. Comr. passed order No. 189/24-9-78 to the effect that Sthl Shanbhog Subbarayappa should look after the duties of the Western Kalve, the duties of the Eastern Kalve being discharged by the Palace Shanbhog Narayappa, the respondents father; and that out of the remuneration determined formerly 10/16 should be taken by the appellant and 6/16 by the respondent. This decision is opposed to Rules Nos. 29 & 33 of Chief Comm's. Circular No. 219 of 27-10-74 and to Pro. No. 1699 of 7-3-78.

4. By the above decision of the Dy. Comr. the Inam Fee is being paid to the respondent contrary to paras 4 and 8 of the

Chief Commissioner's Circular No. 219 and the appellant is thereby subjected to Rs. 5. The potiji apiece to this village is Rs. 102-4-0. Out of this the 6 anna hissedar i.e. respondent is paid Rs. 39-6-6 and the 10 anna hissedar, appellant receives only Rs. 62-13-6. The assessment of Rs. 84¼ on the Inam lands is being collected from the appellant alone and out of the sum of Rs. 67 entered against the respondent's name he pays only Rs. 5/= being the quit-rent charged on his Inam lands in consideration of his services of Shanbhog being dispensed with and his claim to the same having ceased. The respondent is being thus paid Rs. 42/= plus Rs. 39-6-6 being 6/16 of the potiji. His income amounts to Rs. 81-6-6. Whereas the appellant, the Stal Shanbhog, who discharges the duties of the office is being paid only Rs. 62-13-6 out of the potiji amount, while the whole of the Inam amount viz Rs. 84¼ is being taken from him. Thus the respondent whose claim over the place of Shanbhog has ceased is getting more than the Stal Shanbhog himself.

6. After paying off the sum of Rs. 39-6-6 out of the potiji amount as above seen to the respondent, the appellant is being paid Rs. 62-13-6 instead of the whole of the potiji amount. And according to the Chief Comd's circular No. 219 of 27-10-. The Rule 23, the appellant has not been exempted from the payment of Rs. 10-11-3

under each channel".

6- On this the 2nd Councillor proposed that the Councillor reporter should be awarded and the Dy. Comr. was asked to expedite the submission of his final proposals.

No. 875/P.T. 120-93 dt 17-3-98

7- In reply the Dy. Comr has forwarded copy of letter No. 131 dt 4-9-98 from the Sub-Division officer, Jaunsa Chikballapur stating that the Dy. Surveyor of Jaribanda deemphes in his Report No. 71 the 3rd ultimo two ways of effecting the distribution viz. Channelwar and Numberwar. "The Dy surveyor thinks that the Channelwar division of the lands for two separate charges will be attended with difficulties and lead to confusion. The best method would be that by which the two Channbhogs can distinguish easily the lands of each charge".

No. 455/390 dt 4-10-98

"I agree with the Dy Surveyor in his recommendation of a Numberwar division. He makes two proposals - to allot to the 10 anna share Survey Nos. 16-310 with an approximate assessment of Rs. 3388-4-a and the rest of them Nos. 311-444 with an approximate assessment of Rs. 1976-12-a & the 6 anna share. Survey Nos. 16-225, assessment Rs. 1992-12-a and to the 10 anna share Nos. 226-444 assessment Rs.

35 -2-4-0 - the 6 anna charge will have by the first method lands of some 35 Rs. assessment in excess and by the second method lands of some 19 Rs in excess, of course giving rise to a difficulty in like cases for the 6 anna charge. The Potiji on an assessment of Rs. 35 or 19 must be very small and I beg to propose for your consideration the division of charges into survey nos 1-310 and 311-444 as the best possible under the circumstances as a frame at the Rakas would show. Even here nos. 311-315 which would belong to the 6 anna share remain higher up and close to the 6 anna share and if all these nos. are added on to the 6 anna charge a better division can be obtained. I have asked the Dy. Surveyor to let me know the extent and assessment of nos. 311 to 315 and shall submit the information soon as it is received.

"The Rakas in original and the other records are also submitted."

8 As promised above the Sub Division officer has in his docket Nos. 186 of 19-9-38 furnished the marginally noted details as regards the Extent and assessment of Survey nos. 311-315 situated below the Amani Nirakalgara bank of the Kadibunda Range

nos.	Extent	assessment
	a - g	Rs.
311 —	a - 11	— 1 -
312 —	a - 37	— 3 -
313 —	a - 8	— 1 -
314 —	1 - 20	— 7 -
315 —	6 - 35	— 37
Total -	9 - 31	— 49

9. The Dy. Surveyor states that he concurs with the Sub Division officer's

(5)

M 108 of 1892-93

Appts

Adinarayana Appa Rao
Zamindar of Chandbhog
Nawabagram Sub Registry Office.
of Godavari
District

Respt

Krishnappa.—

Appt is the Zamindar of the State Chandbhog, the Respt Circar Chandbhog. In 1878, both Appt & Respt's father were appointed Joint Patels, & they were directed to divide the Profits in the proportion of 10 & 6 annas respectively. In Feby 1892, the Sub Dn Officer ordered the Patels divided equally between the Appt & Respt, In Feby 1893, the Dt Court ordered the two to divide, & the Office by turns once every two years. Appeal is against this order in so far as it directs that the Respt be removed from Office as he has no right to it, & as appointment of two Chandbhogs for one village is contrary to law.

Respt having been appointed so long ago as 1878, cannot be now turned out; but the Govt consider the order of the Dt Court directing the Patels to be divided by turns unobjectionable. The order for holding

the streams by turns
is contrary to the
existing practice
& rules.—

Under all the
circumstances of the
case, I am inclined
that both the appl & respt
be appointed as joint
Shanbhogs of the ~~the~~
Patel divides between
them in the proportion of
10 & 6 annas as decided
in 1878. The Dy Com'r
may make suitable
arrangements for the
diversion of water between
the appl & respt.—

MP
30/9/93

30/9

20-6 CONFIDENTIAL

Petn no 1214 of
1899-1900

Ref to 1st CV

1

My 16/9/W

Rec'd 7pm
11.IX.00

Sayyad Muradu
abandonment
application -

13.3.07

Cl
14/3/07
Encs.

DOC: Encl: put up.
SM 15/3/07.

Pet
1116

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM. 3

The accompanying Petition No. 1740/108
dated 10—1—93 received at the
Dewan's Office from Adinarayappa, Gumastha of Handijiri Soobroyappa, Shanbog of Byrasagarkere, Gudiban Taluk, appealing against the D. Comm. 9/11-12-92 regarding the division of the amount between the Sthala Shanbog & the Govt Shanbogue of the said village

R. 153-92-2

is forwarded, together with its one enclosure, to the D. Comr., Kolar District for submission of Report with a report on the facts of the case & on the statements in the petition.

2. The Petn shd be returned

By Order

Draft

BANGALORE,
Feby 1893.

for Chief Secretary.

M. G. C. P. Bangalore.—21-11-92—3,000.

Ref & No 3162/751 of 18-4-93

(Decision in Appeal No 108 of 1892-93 continued)

the proportion of 10 and 6 annas, as decided in 1878. The Deputy Commissioner may make suitable arrangements for the division of work between the Appellant and Respondent.

By order

Chief Secretary.

M
19 10 93

Redraft.

No 1906
" P.F. 120-93 dt 5.5.94
9.

Copy forwarded to the Deputy Commissioner Kolar District, with the records received with his No: 316 R / 751 dated 18th April 1893.

By order

Chief Secretary

Sk

appellant alone for the
of Shamboque he has been
charging; and out of
Sum of Rs 47 ~~chargd~~ only
against the Respondent
he charges only Rs 5- being
Quitrent charged on his
lands in consideration
services of Shamboque being
pensed with and his d
for the same having
the Respondent is being
paid Rs 42 in addition
to the Police amount of
i.e. a total amount of Rs
whereas the appellant
Sthanal Shamboque and
who discharges the duties
Office is being paid only
out of the police amount
the whole of the Inam
Viz Rs 84 1/4 is being taken
him. Thus the Resp
the one whose claim
place of shamboque
Ceased is getting
the Sthanal Shamboque

(6) After purging
Sum of Rs 39 6 6 out
amt as above seen
Respondent, the C
Sthanal Shamboque

ਸਾਰਾ ਸਾਮਾਨ ਤੇ ਸਾਰੀ ਜਾਇਦਾਦ ਜੋ ਮੈਂ ਮਰਨ ਵੇਲੇ ਛੱਡਾਂ ਮੇਰੀ ਵਸੀਅਤ ਮੁਤਾਬਕ ਮੇਰੇ ਵਾਰਸਾਂ ਨੂੰ ਮਿਲੇ ਜਿਸ ਦੀ ਤਫ਼ਸੀਲ ਇਸ ਤਰ੍ਹਾਂ ਹੈ।

ਜਾਇਦਾਦ ਮਨਕੂਲਾ ਜੋ ਮੈਂ ਮਰਨ ਵੇਲੇ ਛੱਡਾਂ ਮੇਰੀ ਵਸੀਅਤ ਮੁਤਾਬਕ ਮੇਰੇ ਵਾਰਸਾਂ ਨੂੰ ਮਿਲੇ ਜਿਸ ਦੀ ਤਫ਼ਸੀਲ ਇਸ ਤਰ੍ਹਾਂ ਹੈ।

(1) ਮੇਰੀ ਜਾਇਦਾਦ ਜੋ ਮੈਂ ਮਰਨ ਵੇਲੇ ਛੱਡਾਂ ਮੇਰੀ ਵਸੀਅਤ ਮੁਤਾਬਕ ਮੇਰੇ ਵਾਰਸਾਂ ਨੂੰ ਮਿਲੇ ਜਿਸ ਦੀ ਤਫ਼ਸੀਲ ਇਸ ਤਰ੍ਹਾਂ ਹੈ।

(2) ਮੇਰੀ ਜਾਇਦਾਦ ਜੋ ਮੈਂ ਮਰਨ ਵੇਲੇ ਛੱਡਾਂ ਮੇਰੀ ਵਸੀਅਤ ਮੁਤਾਬਕ ਮੇਰੇ ਵਾਰਸਾਂ ਨੂੰ ਮਿਲੇ ਜਿਸ ਦੀ ਤਫ਼ਸੀਲ ਇਸ ਤਰ੍ਹਾਂ ਹੈ।

(3) ਮੇਰੀ ਜਾਇਦਾਦ ਜੋ ਮੈਂ ਮਰਨ ਵੇਲੇ ਛੱਡਾਂ ਮੇਰੀ ਵਸੀਅਤ ਮੁਤਾਬਕ ਮੇਰੇ ਵਾਰਸਾਂ ਨੂੰ ਮਿਲੇ ਜਿਸ ਦੀ ਤਫ਼ਸੀਲ ਇਸ ਤਰ੍ਹਾਂ ਹੈ।

(4) ਮੇਰੀ ਜਾਇਦਾਦ ਜੋ ਮੈਂ ਮਰਨ ਵੇਲੇ ਛੱਡਾਂ ਮੇਰੀ ਵਸੀਅਤ ਮੁਤਾਬਕ ਮੇਰੇ ਵਾਰਸਾਂ ਨੂੰ ਮਿਲੇ ਜਿਸ ਦੀ ਤਫ਼ਸੀਲ ਇਸ ਤਰ੍ਹਾਂ ਹੈ।

(5) ਮੇਰੀ ਜਾਇਦਾਦ ਜੋ ਮੈਂ ਮਰਨ ਵੇਲੇ ਛੱਡਾਂ ਮੇਰੀ ਵਸੀਅਤ ਮੁਤਾਬਕ ਮੇਰੇ ਵਾਰਸਾਂ ਨੂੰ ਮਿਲੇ ਜਿਸ ਦੀ ਤਫ਼ਸੀਲ ਇਸ ਤਰ੍ਹਾਂ ਹੈ।

ਮੇਰੀ ਜਾਇਦਾਦ ਜੋ ਮੈਂ ਮਰਨ ਵੇਲੇ ਛੱਡਾਂ ਮੇਰੀ ਵਸੀਅਤ ਮੁਤਾਬਕ ਮੇਰੇ ਵਾਰਸਾਂ ਨੂੰ ਮਿਲੇ ਜਿਸ ਦੀ ਤਫ਼ਸੀਲ ਇਸ ਤਰ੍ਹਾਂ ਹੈ।

(1) ਮੇਰੀ ਜਾਇਦਾਦ ਜੋ ਮੈਂ ਮਰਨ ਵੇਲੇ ਛੱਡਾਂ ਮੇਰੀ ਵਸੀਅਤ ਮੁਤਾਬਕ ਮੇਰੇ ਵਾਰਸਾਂ ਨੂੰ ਮਿਲੇ ਜਿਸ ਦੀ ਤਫ਼ਸੀਲ ਇਸ ਤਰ੍ਹਾਂ ਹੈ।

ਮੇਰੀ ਜਾਇਦਾਦ ਜੋ ਮੈਂ ਮਰਨ ਵੇਲੇ ਛੱਡਾਂ ਮੇਰੀ ਵਸੀਅਤ ਮੁਤਾਬਕ ਮੇਰੇ ਵਾਰਸਾਂ ਨੂੰ ਮਿਲੇ ਜਿਸ ਦੀ ਤਫ਼ਸੀਲ ਇਸ ਤਰ੍ਹਾਂ ਹੈ।

(2) ਮੇਰੀ ਜਾਇਦਾਦ ਜੋ ਮੈਂ ਮਰਨ ਵੇਲੇ ਛੱਡਾਂ ਮੇਰੀ ਵਸੀਅਤ ਮੁਤਾਬਕ ਮੇਰੇ ਵਾਰਸਾਂ ਨੂੰ ਮਿਲੇ ਜਿਸ ਦੀ ਤਫ਼ਸੀਲ ਇਸ ਤਰ੍ਹਾਂ ਹੈ।

(3) ਮੇਰੀ ਜਾਇਦਾਦ ਜੋ ਮੈਂ ਮਰਨ ਵੇਲੇ ਛੱਡਾਂ ਮੇਰੀ ਵਸੀਅਤ ਮੁਤਾਬਕ ਮੇਰੇ ਵਾਰਸਾਂ ਨੂੰ ਮਿਲੇ ਜਿਸ ਦੀ ਤਫ਼ਸੀਲ ਇਸ ਤਰ੍ਹਾਂ ਹੈ।

[illegible] 42 [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] 39 6 6 [illegible]
[illegible] 42 [illegible]
[illegible] 81-6-6 [illegible]
[illegible] 84¼ [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] 62 13-6 [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

(6). [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] 6 [illegible] 39-6-6
[illegible] 62-13-6 [illegible]
[illegible] 74
[illegible] 27 [illegible] 21 [illegible]
[illegible] 23 [illegible]
[illegible]
21-6-6 [illegible] 10-11-3 [illegible]
[illegible]

(7) 1881 [illegible] 85 [illegible]
[illegible] 5 [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] 189 [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

5470
R&L 904

Gen. 31.]

1898

From The Dy: Commissioner Kolar District

To

The Secretary to the Government of Mysore.
Dewan of Mysore.
General Revenue Department

Dated 26
Despatched 28 January 1898.
Received

General No. 2459
No. 733

Enclosure No. 1 & record.

His docket No. 4488 date 16 November 1896 (R.D.-120-93) requesting to report on the working of the arrangement ordered in accordance with the decision of Government on Appeal No. 108 of 1892-93 (Adinaranappa ~~Vethrish~~ -nappa) directing that both the appellant and the Respondent be appointed joint Shanbhogues of Bhyrasagar-Kere, Gudibanda Sub Taluk and the Patgi divided between them

5th Commr
wd. been called for in
June 1896. Even now the
is not complete as the D
submitting ~~a~~ report
the arrangements ~~the~~ Village
~~Village~~ charges corresponding
channels of the tank.
division will apparently
be made in communication
Survey Supt.

M 9/2/98

wait further
but may not
Dy Commr final
proposals moved
be expedited
VS
10.3.98

Noted
M 9/3/98

Rev 31/1/98
20/93 relating to the
at is put up.

Sub L.R. 153-97-8

w the proportion of 10
nnas and 6 annas
s decided in 1878

With reference to the above, has the honor to forward herewith docket No 198 dated 21st October last from the Sub Divisional Officer of Chickballapur together with such vernacular papers as were forwarded therewith. It would appear that no distribution of work has been made between them and that they are jointly conducting the work. It would also appear that the men are not working smoothly The charge is however a large one with an area of 1097 acres 20 guntas assessed at Rs 5344-12-11. Two thanbdars were considered necessary at the Survey Settlement and it is desirable to have both.

The

Gen. 31.]

1898-99

From The Subdivisional officer
& Chickballapur

L.R. 153-92-11

To

The ~~Secretary to the~~ Deputy Commissioner
~~Dewan of Mysore~~
Kolar District

Dated 19th September 1898

Despatched

Received

General No. 136
No.

Enclosure No.

312	0	37	
313	0	8	
314	1	20	
315	6	35	
Total	9	31	

3	—	8	—
1	—	0	—
7	—	0	—
37	—	0	—
49	—	8	—

In Continuation of this office letter No 131 dated the 14th Instant has the honor to detail in the margin the extent and assessment of Survey numbers 311-315, Situated below the Amani Bavisagara bank of the Gudibanda Range —.

(Signed) K. S. Doraswamiyer
Subordinate officer Chick-
" - ballapur.

"Copy"

Mohd Baig.
for Deputy Commissioner
Kolar district

The other records are also submitted herewith.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant.

(Signed) K. Doraswamy Ayyar.
Subdivisional officer.
Chickballapur

"Copy"

Illegible
for Deputy Commissioner
Kolar

DEPARTMENT
5662
MAR 1899
Pet. No. 347

Gen. 31.]

1899

From The Deputy Commissioner
Kolar District

To

The Secretary to the Government
~~Dewan~~ of Mysore.
General and Revenue departments.

Dated 3rd March 1899
Despatched 4th.
Received
General No. 3284
No. 829
Enclosure No. 1. Records with plan and a Copy No. 40

His No: 4146 Pet 9 120-93 dated 10th December 1898 calling for information as to whether the Stala & Sirkar Shanbhogs of the Birasagara Tank in the Gudibanda Sub Taluk would not agree to some arrangement by which one of them should be the principal & the other his deputy.

I have the honor to state that the Shanbhogs referred to, do not agree

agree to the arrangement proposed

Copy of the Subordinate Officer's No: 408 dated 20th February 99 in the matter is submitted herewith, together with the vernacular records.

H H Sparke
Deputy Commissioner
Kolar District

True

(15)

Proc^s of the Govt of Pollepore

Read again

Decision of Govt^r of 5th May /94 in Appeal No 108 of 1892-93 (Adinarappa Sannasta of Subbayappa & Krishnappa) directing that both the appt^s (Sthala Shanbhog) and Respt^s (Sirkar Shanbhog) be appointed as joint Shanbhogs of Bavasagankere, Gudibanda Sub-Taluk, that the Patigi be divided between them in the proportion of 10 and 6 as respectively as decided in 1878 and that the Dy Commr might make suitable arrangements for the division of work between them

Read also

(1) Petition No 1102 of 26th Septr /96 from the said Adinarappa Sannasta of the Sthala Shanbhog Subbayappa praying for reconsideration of the above decision and for his appointment as

Draft^t for appt^s (The draft follows the Committee's order on the precis)
Submd to 1st Committee
Dy 29/7/98

1870
30.7.98

Submd to 2nd Committee
Dy 1/8/98.

99.

G.O. R. 153-92-15

Sent
Dy 28/8/98

39

Sent
Dy 31/8/98

sole Shanbhog.

(2) Correspondence ending with letter No. 1453/390 of 4-10-98 from the Dy Commr Kolar Dist reporting that two Shanbhogs are necessary for the villages and that with regard to the distribution of work between the two Shanbhogs, he concurs with the Sub Dy Officer of Chikballapur in proposing to give to the Sthala Shanbhog S. Nos 1 to 315 and to the Sirkar Shanbhog Nos 316 to 444

2009
OF 120 of 1893 24/9/1

Order thereon

The Govt concur in the view taken by the Dy Comr Kolar, as to the necessity for the performance of the duties, that two Shanbhogs are necessary for the charge in question, and that the proposed distribution of the S. Nos as proposed by the Sub Dy Officer and the Dy Comr. is equitable and is the best way of giving effect to the Govt

Pr 14 ಸಂಚಾಲಕರಿಗೆ ಪತ್ರ

No. 1102-1740-ಸೆಟ್ಟಿ-5-9-99

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು

L.R. 153-92-16

ಸಂಚಾಲಕರ ಹುದ್ದೆಗೆ ಆಯ್ಕೆ ಪಟ್ಟಿಯನ್ನು ಅನುಮೋದಿಸಿ ಆದೇಶ ಹೊರಡಿಸುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ

ಸಹಕಾರಿ ಸಂಘಗಳ ಉಪನಿಬಂಧಕರು ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಇವರ ಕಛೇರಿಯ ಅಧಿಸೂಚನೆ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: ಸಹಕಾರ ಸಂಘಗಳು ಸಿಆರ್ 94 ಸಿಒಎಂ 94 ದಿನಾಂಕ 5-5-94 ರಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಕಟವಾಗಿರುವ 1740 A.S.108 ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯ ಅಧಿಸೂಚನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸಹಕಾರ ಸಂಘಗಳ ಅಧಿನಿಯಮ ಕಲಂ 26-ಎ ಮತ್ತು ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಸಹಕಾರ ಸಂಘಗಳ ನಿಯಮಗಳು 1102 ರ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಸಂಚಾಲಕರ ಹುದ್ದೆಗೆ ಆಯ್ಕೆ ಮಾಡಲು ಅಧಿಸೂಚಿಸಲಾಗಿದ್ದ ಹುದ್ದೆಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟಂತೆ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಲಾಗಿದ್ದ ಅರ್ಜಿಗಳನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಿ ಆಯ್ಕೆ ಸಮಿತಿಯು ಸಿದ್ಧಪಡಿಸಿರುವ ಆಯ್ಕೆ ಪಟ್ಟಿಯನ್ನು ಅನುಮೋದಿಸಿ ಆದೇಶ ಹೊರಡಿಸುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ

ಸಹಕಾರಿ ಸಂಘಗಳ ಉಪನಿಬಂಧಕರು ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಇವರ ಕಛೇರಿಯ ಅಧಿಸೂಚನೆ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: ಸಹಕಾರ ಸಂಘಗಳು ಸಿಆರ್ 94 ಸಿಒಎಂ 94 ದಿನಾಂಕ 5-5-94 ರಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಕಟವಾಗಿರುವ 1740 A.S.108 ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯ ಅಧಿಸೂಚನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸಹಕಾರ ಸಂಘಗಳ ಅಧಿನಿಯಮ ಕಲಂ 26-ಎ ಮತ್ತು ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಸಹಕಾರ ಸಂಘಗಳ ನಿಯಮಗಳು 1102 ರ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಸಂಚಾಲಕರ ಹುದ್ದೆಗೆ ಆಯ್ಕೆ ಮಾಡಲು ಅಧಿಸೂಚಿಸಲಾಗಿದ್ದ ಹುದ್ದೆಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟಂತೆ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಲಾಗಿದ್ದ ಅರ್ಜಿಗಳನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಿ ಆಯ್ಕೆ ಸಮಿತಿಯು ಸಿದ್ಧಪಡಿಸಿರುವ ಆಯ್ಕೆ ಪಟ್ಟಿಯನ್ನು ಅನುಮೋದಿಸಿ ಆದೇಶ ಹೊರಡಿಸುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ

ಸಹಕಾರಿ ಸಂಘಗಳ ಉಪನಿಬಂಧಕರು ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಇವರ ಕಛೇರಿಯ ಅಧಿಸೂಚನೆ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: ಸಹಕಾರ ಸಂಘಗಳು ಸಿಆರ್ 94 ಸಿಒಎಂ 94 ದಿನಾಂಕ 5-5-94 ರಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಕಟವಾಗಿರುವ 1740 A.S.108 ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯ ಅಧಿಸೂಚನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸಹಕಾರ ಸಂಘಗಳ ಅಧಿನಿಯಮ ಕಲಂ 26-ಎ ಮತ್ತು ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಸಹಕಾರ ಸಂಘಗಳ ನಿಯಮಗಳು 1102 ರ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಸಂಚಾಲಕರ ಹುದ್ದೆಗೆ ಆಯ್ಕೆ ಮಾಡಲು ಅಧಿಸೂಚಿಸಲಾಗಿದ್ದ ಹುದ್ದೆಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟಂತೆ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಲಾಗಿದ್ದ ಅರ್ಜಿಗಳನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಿ ಆಯ್ಕೆ ಸಮಿತಿಯು ಸಿದ್ಧಪಡಿಸಿರುವ ಆಯ್ಕೆ ಪಟ್ಟಿಯನ್ನು ಅನುಮೋದಿಸಿ ಆದೇಶ ಹೊರಡಿಸುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ

Dated 31-8-94

Secretary

Dated 31-8-94

Secretary

8 [illegible] 76 [illegible]

84 - 85 [illegible]

84 - 4 [illegible]

[illegible]

9 1885 [illegible] 16 [illegible] 950 - 68 [illegible]

[illegible] 84 - 4 [illegible]

84 - 85 [illegible]

950 - 68 [illegible]

102 - 4 [illegible] 6 [illegible]

[illegible] 39 - 6 - 6 [illegible]

[illegible] 23 [illegible]

[illegible] 10 - 3 - 3 [illegible]

[illegible]

10 [illegible]

11 [illegible] 18 - 9 - 77 [illegible] 606/14 [illegible]

[illegible] 3 - 78 [illegible] 1069/229 [illegible]

[illegible] (2) [illegible] 3160

[illegible] 444 [illegible]

[illegible]

12 [illegible] 2 [illegible]

2 [illegible]

[illegible]

ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಯವರು ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ ಕಡತಗಳನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಿ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಸೂಚನೆಗಳನ್ನು ನೀಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ.

ಈ ಕಛೇರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿರುವ ಅರ್ಜಿಗಳ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ 1102 ಆಗಿದ್ದು, ಅವುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ 31 ಅರ್ಜಿಗಳನ್ನು ತಿರಸ್ಕರಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಉಳಿದ 1071 ಅರ್ಜಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗಾಗಲೇ 1069 ಅರ್ಜಿಗಳನ್ನು ವಿಲೇವಾರಿ ಮಾಡಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಉಳಿದ 2 ಅರ್ಜಿಗಳು ಮಾತ್ರ ಬಾಕಿ ಇರುತ್ತವೆ. ಬಾಕಿ ಇರುವ ಅರ್ಜಿಗಳನ್ನು ಸಹ ಶೀಘ್ರವಾಗಿ ವಿಲೇವಾರಿ ಮಾಡಲಾಗುವುದು.

ಈ ಕಛೇರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿರುವ ಅರ್ಜಿಗಳ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ 1102 ಆಗಿದ್ದು, ಅವುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ 31 ಅರ್ಜಿಗಳನ್ನು ತಿರಸ್ಕರಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಉಳಿದ 1071 ಅರ್ಜಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗಾಗಲೇ 1069 ಅರ್ಜಿಗಳನ್ನು ವಿಲೇವಾರಿ ಮಾಡಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಉಳಿದ 2 ಅರ್ಜಿಗಳು ಮಾತ್ರ ಬಾಕಿ ಇರುತ್ತವೆ. ಬಾಕಿ ಇರುವ ಅರ್ಜಿಗಳನ್ನು ಸಹ ಶೀಘ್ರವಾಗಿ ವಿಲೇವಾರಿ ಮಾಡಲಾಗುವುದು.

ಈ ಕಛೇರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿರುವ ಅರ್ಜಿಗಳ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ 1102 ಆಗಿದ್ದು, ಅವುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ 31 ಅರ್ಜಿಗಳನ್ನು ತಿರಸ್ಕರಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಉಳಿದ 1071 ಅರ್ಜಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗಾಗಲೇ 1069 ಅರ್ಜಿಗಳನ್ನು ವಿಲೇವಾರಿ ಮಾಡಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಉಳಿದ 2 ಅರ್ಜಿಗಳು ಮಾತ್ರ ಬಾಕಿ ಇರುತ್ತವೆ. ಬಾಕಿ ಇರುವ ಅರ್ಜಿಗಳನ್ನು ಸಹ ಶೀಘ್ರವಾಗಿ ವಿಲೇವಾರಿ ಮಾಡಲಾಗುವುದು.